

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-14 are presently pending. Claims amended herein are 3-5 and 8. Claims cancelled herein are none. New claims added herein are none.

Herein, the "Action" or "Office Action" or "Office" refers to the Office Action dated August 11, 2003.

Telephone Conference

An attorney for the Applicant spoke to the Examiner on October 1, 2003 about the latest Action. The main point of the discussion was distinguishing the primary reference (Lin) and the claims. Those points are summarized herein.

Prior Art Status of References

Applicant does not explicitly or implicitly admit that any reference is prior art. Nothing in this communication should be considered an acknowledgement, acceptance, or admission that any reference is considered prior art.

Informal Rejections

The Office rejects claims 3-5 and 8 under under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Office notes specifically, that these claims reference "the MFD" without a sufficient antecedent basis.

Applicant amends these claims herein to provide a sufficient antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully asks the Office to withdraw this rejection in light of these amendments.

Substantive Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections under §102

The Office rejects all pending claims under §102. For the reasons set forth below, the Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of anticipation (i.e., §102). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

The Office's rejections are based upon the following reference: Lin: *Lin et al.*, US Patent No. 6,421,748.

Based upon Lin

The Office rejects claims 1-14 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin. Applicant traverses this rejection.

Claim 1

The Office indicates that Lin discloses all of the features of this claim. Applicant submits that Lin does not.

Claim 1 recites, "a source-selection determiner configured to determine a source selected for a Mopy in a Mopy job *from multiple sources* on the MFD [emphasis added]."

On page 3 of the Action, the Office indicates that Lin discloses this. Applicant respectfully submits that Lin does not disclose, teach, or suggest "a source-selection determiner" as recited in claim 1.

At col. 3, lines 4-8, Lin discloses that the interface 102 may be used to "select any desired *property* for the document output, such as, paper size, resolution, number of copies, etc. [emphasis added]." Applicant respectfully

1 submits that Lin does not expressly state that "determines a source" (as recited
2 in claim 1. Rather, Lin helps determine the properties of an output. Properties
3 such as "paper size, resolution, and number of copies."

4 Applicant respectfully submits that a selection of a "property" of an
5 output is not equivalent to a selection of a "source."

6 While Lin does not expressly state that a source is selected, Applicant
7 submits that it does not inferentially suggest this either. Lin never teaches that
8 a device will inferentially choose a differ output when one selects a specific
9 "resolution" or a specific "number of copies."

10 The Applicant submits that the ability to select document properties
11 does not infer the ability to select from multiple sources. Instead, Lin's
12 selection interface allows the selection of output properties and not, as is
13 claimed, "determin[ation of] a *source* selected for a Mopy in a Mopy job."

14 Applicant submits that there is nothing disclosed in Lin indicating that a
15 selection of a document property is equivalent to selection of a source amongst
16 multiple sources. With Lin, the user is incapable of actually selecting a single
17 source, it never discloses of the capability of selecting from multiple sources.

18 Claim 1 recites, "a destination-selection determiner configured to
19 determine a destination selected for a Mopy in a Mopy job *from multiple*
20 *destinations on the MFD* [emphasis added]." The multiple destinations are on
21 a single device (namely, the MFD).

22 Applicant respectfully submits that instead of selecting amongst
23 multiple destinations on a particular device (namely, the MFD), Lin discloses
24 selection amongst multiple *devices* on a network.

25 At col. 2, lines 57-67 and col. 3, lines 1-8, Lin discloses a "listing and
selecting interface 102" for "displaying all available *output devices* accessible
in the network, such as printers, overhead projectors, viewers, and fax

1 machines [emphasis added]." Applicant submits that Lin's interface for
2 "displaying...output devices" is not a "source-selection determiner configured
3 to determine a source."

4 Furthermore, Lin does not disclose a Mopy-enabled multifunction
5 device (MFD) as claimed in claim 1. Rather, it discloses a network having
6 multiple devices. Each device is presumably capable of only one function,
7 such as faxing, printing, etc.

8 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
9 its rejections.

10
11 Claim 2

12 Claim 2 is allowable for the same reasons given for claim 1 above.

13 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
14 its rejections.

15
16 Claims 3-5

17 These claims are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 1
18 above.

19 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
20 its rejections.

21
22 Claims 6 - 8

23 These claims are allowable for the same reasons given for claim 1
24 above.

25 According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw
its rejections.

Claims 9-14

The Office indicates that these claims are of similar scope as claim 1 and therefore are rejected under the same rationale given for rejection of claim 1. If so, then Applicant submits that these claims are allowable for the same reasons given above for the allowability of claim 1.

According to the above reasons, Applicant asks the Office to withdraw its rejections.

Conclusion

All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Office is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Dated: 10-8-03

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 

Kasey C. Christie
Reg. No. 40559
(509) 324-9256 x232
kasey@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 09 2003

OFFICIAL

SERIAL NO.: 09/728,097
ATTY DOCKET NO.: 10001448
RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED
AUGUST 11, 2003 UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

15

1008011138 G:\HPI\U27\HPI-127a.m02.doc